

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Bridget Avery of the United States Patent Office for the personal interview conducted on June 21, 2005.

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2005, the abstract was objected to for the use of the phrase "is provided" in line one. Presently, Applicants have amended the abstract so as to delete the phrase "is provided" in line 1.

Claims 1, 2, 18-20 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Williams, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,109,925).

Claims 38, 41, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dudouyt (U.S. Patent No. 4,245,848).

Claims 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 21, 23, 24, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams.

Claims 4, 7, 9, 10, 14-16, 22, 25-27, 32-34, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Dudouyt.

Claims 8 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,648,345).

Claims 13 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over William in view of Oldendorf (U.S. Patent No. 4,060,253).

Claims 39, 40, 42 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dudouyt.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18, 37 and 38 in the manner set forth during the interview of June 21, 2005. By way of brief summary, claim 1 has been amended to call for a skateboard assembly having a mounting member with at least one

flat surface that is configured to be urged towards a resilient member during relative rotation between the flat surface and the resilient member. As disclosed and taught in Williams, the mounting member 34 does not include a flat surface that is urged towards the resilient member 74 during relative rotation between these two components.

Rotation of the mounting member 34 does not cause any flat surface of the mounting member 34 to be urged towards the resilient member 74.

With respect to claim 18, Williams also does not disclose or teach a resilient member that is retained by and in direct contact with the housing. The resilient member 74 in Williams is not in direct contact with either the housing 85 or the retaining member 12.

With respect to claim 37, the combination of Williams in view of Dudouyt does not disclose or teach a truck assembly with an insert that is retained in the cavity in a resilient member and that engages the mounting member. The insert 45 in Dudouyt does not contact the mounting member 10. Further, the insert 45 in Dudouyt is not retained in the cavity of the resilient member through which the mounting member is disposed.

With respect to claim 38, Dudouyt does not disclose a resilient member that includes an insert retained by the body portion of the resilient member and located in the cavity of the resilient member and configured for receiving the mounting member. The insert 45 in Dudouyt is a rectangular elongated bar and does not receive the mounting member 10. As shown in Dudouyt these two components are separated from one another such that the insert 45 does not receive the mounting member 10.

Applicant has deleted claim 44 as the subject matter of this claim was incorporated into claim 38.

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at her convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

July 1, 2005

Date



Neal P. Pierotti
Registration No: 45,716

P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
Fax: (864) 233-7342